

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/828,974	04/21/2004	Duane R. McGregor	JJK-0407 (P2003J058)	5355
27810 75	90 08/04/2006	•	EXAM	INER
EXXONMOBIL RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING COMPANY			SINGH, PREM C	
P.O. BOX 900 1545 ROUTE 2	2 EAST		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	, NJ 08801-0900	•	1764	

DATE MAILED: 08/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/828,974	MCGREGOR ET AL.	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	_
		Prem C. Singh	1764	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication	on appears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence address	1
A SHO WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failui Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILIN asions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 Council SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicating period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory reto reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by reply received by the Office later than three months after the department of the provided patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF THIS COMMUN CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a on. period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC statute, cause the application to become a	ICATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				•
2a)□	Since this application is in condition for all	This action is non-final.  Ilowance except for formal ma		
	closed in accordance with the practice ur	nder <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Dispositi	on of Claims			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application of the above claim(s) is/are with Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction is	thdrawn from consideration.		
Applicati	on Papers	·		
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Exa The drawing(s) filed on <u>21 April 2004</u> is/an Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the of The oath or declaration is objected to by the	re: a) $\square$ accepted or b) $\square$ obj to the drawing(s) be held in abey correction is required if the drawin	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C, § 119			
a)l	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docu 2. Certified copies of the priority docu 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Elee the attached detailed Office action for	iments have been received. Iments have been received in a priority documents have been received in Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Stage	
2) Notice	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94 mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/5 r No(s)/Mail Date 05/06/05,12/16/04.	Paper No.	Summary (PTO-413) b(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 	

Art Unit: 1764

### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The claims are drawn to a catalytic cracking process but the title is not disclosing that it is a catalytic cracking process.

The following title is suggested:

"Fluidized bed catalytic cracking with reduced NO<sub>x</sub> using regenerator additives".

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 1764

Claims 1-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yaluris et al (US Patent 6,660,683).

### Claims 1, 18-20, and 37-38.

Yaluris invention discloses, "The significant steps in the cyclic FCC processes are:

- (i) the feed is catalytically cracked by contacting feed with a source of hot, regenerated cracking catalyst to produce an effluent comprising cracked products and spent catalyst containing coke and strippable hydrocarbons;
- (ii) the effluent is discharged and separated normally in one or more cyclones, into a vapor phase rich in cracked products and a solids-rich phase comprising the spent catalyst;
- (iii) the vapor phase is removed as product and fractionated in the FCC main column and its associated side columns to form gas and liquid cracking products including gasoline;
- (iv) the spent catalyst is stripped, usually with steam, to remove occluded hydrocarbons from the catalyst, after which the stripped catalyst is oxidatively regenerated in a catalyst regeneration zone to produce hot, regenerated catalyst, which is then recycled to the cracking zone for cracking further quantities of feed."

(Column 11, lines 13-35).

Yaluris further discloses, "Preferably, the amount of the compositions used is an amount sufficient to reduce the content of gas phase reduced nitrogen species in the

Art Unit: 1764

flue gas of an FCCU regenerator operated in a partial or incomplete mode of combustion. In order to remove coke from the catalyst, oxygen or air is added to the regeneration zone." (Column 11, lines 58-67).

Yaluris adds, "By removing the gas phase reduced nitrogen species from the effluent of the FCCU regenerator, significant reduction of NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from the CO boiler is achieved. In some cases, NO<sub>x</sub> reduction up to 90% is readily achievable." (Column 12, lines 10-15).

Yaluris invention also discloses the composition of the NOx reducing catalyst, which comprises, " (i) an acidic metal oxide which contains substantially no zeolite; (ii) an alkali metal, alkaline earth metal, and mixtures thereof, measured as the metal oxide; (iii) an oxygen storage component, and (iv) a noble metal component." (Column 4, lines 30-35). "Additional materials optionally present in the compositions of the present invention include, but are not limited to, fillers, binders, etc." (Column 7, lines 62-64). "Where compositions of the invention are integrated into the FCC catalyst particles themselves, any conventional FCC catalyst particles may be used." (Column 10, lines 62-65).

Although Yaluris does not specifically mention the flue gas analysis, the invention does disclose that the 90% NOx is being reduced in the process and therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Yaluris invention and measure the composition of CO and NO<sub>x</sub> in the regenerator effluent gases for an efficient capture of NO<sub>x</sub> in the catalytic cracking process.

Page 6

## Claims 2, 3, 21, and 22.

Yaluris discloses, "In a preferred embodiment of the invention, compositions of the invention are used in the FCC process as separate additives." (Column 4, lines 35-37). "Where compositions of the invention are integrated into the FCC catalyst particles themselves, any conventional FCC catalyst particles may be used." (Column 10, lines 62-65).

## Claims 4 and 23.

Yaluris discloses, "The acidic metal oxide may be crystalline or amorphous."

(Column 6, line 40). "The acidic metal oxide may contain other stabilizing metal oxides."

Column 6, lines 33-34).

## Claims 5 and 24.

Yaluris discloses, "The oxygen storage component may be any metal oxide having oxygen storage capability." (Column 7, lines 14-15).

## Claims 6 and 25.

Yaluris discloses, "Alkali metals useful to prepare the compositions of the invention include, but are not limited to, sodium, potassium, cesium, lithium, and the like." (Column 6, lines 61-64).

Art Unit: 1764

### Claims 7, 8, 26, and 27.

Yaluris discloses, "The noble metals include platinum, palladium, iridium, rhodium, osmium, or ruthenium, rhenium, and mixtures thereof." Column 7, lines 45-48).

#### Claims 9-11, 28-30.

Yaluris discloses, "Preferably, the amount of the acidic metal oxide component ranges from about 5 to about 98% of the total composition." (Column 6, lines 45-51). Yaluris also discloses the amount of alkali metals from 1-20 wt %, alkaline earth metals from 0.5 to 60 wt%, oxygen storage component from 1 to 50 wt%, and the noble metal from 0.1 ppm to 5,000 ppm (Column 6, lines 61-67; column 7, lines 1-60).

Although Yaluris does not specifically mention the ratio of solid acid component to the total weight of metal-containing component, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Yaluris invention and determine the claimed ratios for proper formulation of the NOx additive composition in the FCC process.

### Claims 12-17 and 31-36.

Yaluris discloses, "Where compositions of the invention are integrated into the FCC catalyst particles themselves, any conventional FCC catalyst particles may be used." (Column 10, lines 62-65). "Conventional FCC catalysts include, for example, zeolite based catalysts with a faujasite cracking component. Typically the FCC catalysts consist of a binder, usually silica, alumina, or silica alumina, a Y-type zeolite and fillers

Art Unit: 1764

such as kaolin clay. The Y zeolite may be present in one or more forms and may have been ultra stabilized and/or treated with stabilizing cations." (Column 11, lines 36-49).

Although Yaluris does not specifically mention the ZSM type, medium pore zeolites, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to add medium pore or ZSM type zeolites also in the cracking component because they are functionally similar to Y zeolites as cracking components and expected to perform equivalently as faujasite and Y zeolites.

### Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Buchanan, US Patent 5,705,053.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Prem C. Singh whose telephone number is 571-272-6381. The examiner can normally be reached on MF 6:30 AM-3:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on 571-272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Page 9

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ps/072106